

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action dated July 13, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the Application. Claims 1, 11 and 12 are independent claims.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1-11 are amended including for non-statutory reasons, such as for better form including beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A', and deleting reference numerals typically used in European practice that are known to not limit the scope of the claims. By these non-statutory amendments, claims 1-11 are not amended to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,652,600 to Khormaei ("Khormaei"). Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Khormaei in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,119,773 to Kim ("Kim"). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Khormaei in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,567,171 to Rushing ("Rushing"). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Khormaei in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,771,278 to Pooley ("Pooley"). It is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable over Khormaei alone and in view of any of Kim, Rushing and Pooley for at least the following reasons.

Khormaei shows a system for illuminating active matrix display devices by splitting a frame interval into subframes (e.g., see, FIG. 14). The office action has taken a position that an ordering of the time frames "are just engineering choices of design." (See, Office Action, page 3, lines 6-9.) The Applicants respectfully disagree. In fact Khormaei teaches ordering the subframes such that "each respectively [subsequent subframe] including twice as many voltage pulses than the immediately preceding subframe, to generate a grey scale display." (See, Kohormaei, Col. 8, lines 23-26.)

It is respectfully submitted that the device of Claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Khormaei. For example, Khormaei does not disclose or suggest, a device that amongst other patentable elements, comprises (illustrative emphasis provided) "means coupled to the data lines for generating, during

time intervals of a frame period, at least a first non-zero emission level of a light emitting element during a first one of the time intervals and a second non-zero emission level during a second one of the time intervals, wherein the generating means generates the first and second time intervals in an order that reduces dead times between the time intervals" as required by Claim 1, and as similarly required by each of Claims 11 and 12. Each of Kim, Rushing and Pooley are introduced for allegedly showing elements of the dependent claims and as such, do nothing to cure the deficiencies in Khormaei.


Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 11 and 12 are patentable over Khormaei alone and in view of any of Kim, Rushing and Pooley and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Claims 2-10 and 13-14 respectively depend from one of Claims 1 and 12 and accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the

foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
October 10, 2007

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101